

Docket No. 002566-13000

Serial No. 09/287,296

Page 11

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are submitted under 35 U.S.C. § 132 and 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 in response to the Office Action mailed July 26, 2007.

Summary of the Examiner's Action and Applicants' Response

The Examiner has indicated dependent claims 23, 24, 27, 28, and 33 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-21, 25, 26, 29-32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious based on Bowen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,094,649, "Bowen") in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 6,144,991). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended Claims 23, 27, 28, and 33 into independent and allowable form. Claim 24 has been amended for consistency with Claim 23. Claim 24 depends from Claim 23 and thus respectfully submitted as also being in allowable form.

Claims 1, 18, 21, and 32 have been amended to further define the invention. Claims 1, 9, 17, 18, 21, and 24 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-21, and 23-34 are pending.

Response to Rejection of Claim 1-2, 4-7, 9-21, 25, 26, 29-32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9-21, 25, 26, 29-32, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England.

Regarding Claims 23, 24, 27, 28, and 33, the Examiner acknowledged that "Bowen and England do not teach a pre-condition regular expression, a portion of data of interest regular expression, and a post-condition regular expression and wherein said developing comprises refining at least one of said pre-condition regular expression, said portion of data of interest regular expression, and said post-condition regular expression."

Applicants have amended Claims 1, 18, 21, and 32 to include recitation that the extraction pattern includes at least one regular expression. Support for the amendments is found throughout the specification as filed, e.g., page 15, lines 13-15 and 24-25. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bowen, et al, nor England, either singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest the methods of Claims 1 and 32, the apparatus, of Claim 18, the computer data signal of Claim 21,

10765361.4

Docket No. 002566-13000

Serial No. 09/287,296

Page 12

wherein the extraction pattern includes at least one regular expression. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that Claims 1, 18, 21, and 32 are non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-17, 25, 26, and 29 depend from Claim 1 and are thus respectively submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the reasons given above for Claim 1. Claims 19, 20, and 30 depend from Claim 18 and are thus respectively submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the reasons given above for Claim 18. Claim 31 depends from Claim 21 and is thus respectively submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the reasons given above for Claim 21. Claim 34 depends from Claim 32 and is thus respectively submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the reasons given above for Claim 32.

Further regarding Claim 1, the Examiner stated that Bowen teaches "(ii) developing an extraction pattern from a web page output from the respective web site using a graphical user interface tool ... (col.12, lines 5--34)". In contrast to this assertion, the Examiner then acknowledges that "[h]owever, Bowen does not explicitly teach developing an extraction pattern based on output from the respective web site using a graphical user interface tool." (Emphasis added). That is, the Examiner acknowledged that Bowen does not teach "(ii) developing an extraction pattern from a web page output from the respective web site using a graphical user interface tool" in Claim 1. The Examiner stated that Bowen uses a Graphical User Interface (GUI) for sending documents. The Examiner states that England discloses "developing an extraction pattern based on output from the respective web site using a graphical user interface tool, (col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 25). The Examiner concluded that "... it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to "include graphical user interface (GUI) in a browser to extract information in a pattern format as discloses in England." Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully submit that the portion of England cited by Examiner is merely describing conventional browsers, i.e., where "[t]conventional browsers are Netscape Navigator and Microsoft Internet Explorer." (See Col. 2, line 65 - Col. 3, line 15). England also discloses various operations a user can perform through the GUI of the browser, e.g., pick commands, start programs, etc. (Col. 3, lines 16-25). Applicants respectfully submit that England does not teach or suggest "developing an extraction pattern based on output from the respective web site using a GUI tool". as

10765361.4

Docket No. 002566-13000

Serial No. 09/287,296

Page 13

claimed in Claim 1. As noted above, the Examiner has acknowledged that "Bowen does not explicitly teach developing an extraction pattern based on output from the respective web site using a graphical user interface tool." Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bowen nor England, either singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest developing an extraction pattern based on output from the respective web site using a GUI tool, as claimed in Claim 1.

Further, the Examiner concluded that "... it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to "include graphical user interface (GUI) in a browser to extract information in a pattern format as discloses in England." (Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that "extracting information in a pattern format" is not claimed. Instead, development of extraction patterns using an output of the website is claimed in Claim 1.

Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Bowen discloses search engine technology and operation thereof which searches web page indexes for web pages that match the keyword query entered into the search engine. Bowen also discloses a database reader that uses SQL queries to extract the exposed data from the database. Of course, various search engine technologies and use of SQL in databases are well known in the art, but this is not the subject of the claimed invention. Rather than creating programs such as crawlers that extract information from web pages of a web site as taught in the prior art, the present invention allows the output of the web site to be used to generate extraction patterns that are then used to extract the desired information from the web pages of the web site. (See page 24, line 15 - Page 25, line 4). Applicants respectfully submit that mere search engines such as that described in Bowen cannot perform the function of the present invention. For instance, in the system of Bowen, the particulars for each book, such as a title, author, or other parameter would be required in order to retrieve information about books from a web site. Applicants respectfully submit that extraction patterns of the present invention and recited in the present claims are not the same, or even equivalent to, keyword queries. Thus, even if the system disclosed in Bowen could theoretically be modified to have a customized GUI as disclosed in England, such a theoretical combination would still fail to result in a system as claimed that allows developing of an extraction pattern based on the output from the respective web site, or extracting of information from a plurality of web pages from a web site using the developed extraction pattern, as claimed in Claim 1.

10765361.4

Docket No. 002566-13000

Serial No. 09/287,296

Page 14

Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 is non-obvious based on Bowen and England for these additional reasons.. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-17, 25, 26, and 29 depend from Claim 1 and are thus respectively submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the additional reasons given above for Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 18, 21, and 32 are non-obvious based on Bowen and England for the additional reasons given above for Claim 1.

Further regarding Claim 4, Applicants respectfully submit that Bowen does not disclose or suggest application of an extraction pattern to the output of the web site displayed in a source view. It is respectfully submitted that the cited portion of the Bowen reference (Col. 13, lines 5-52) relied upon by the Examiner merely describes operation of indexing technology that utilizes SQL to search for, and retrieve, documents that match the query. Applicants respectfully submit that Bowen does not disclose application of an extraction pattern to the output of a web site that is displayed in a source view, as claimed in Claim 4. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that, just because different views may be possible in prior art systems, does not mean that an extraction pattern is applied to a particular view as recited. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 4 is non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for these additional reasons.

Further regarding Claim 5, Applicants respectfully submit that neither England nor Bowen, either singly or in any theoretical combination, disclose or suggest a plurality of predefined extraction patterns as claimed in Claim 5, at least because extraction patterns are not utilized in the systems of England and Bowen. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for this additional reason

Further regarding Claim 9, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited portion of Bowen (Col. 13, lines 5-52) relied upon by the Examiner describes operation of indexing technology that utilizes SQL to search for, and retrieve, documents that match the query, and does not appear to be relevant to the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 9 is non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for this additional reason.

Further regarding Claim 12, this claim recites applying a test condition comprising a logical test for at least one corresponding argument. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bowen, et al, nor England, singly or in any theoretical combination, teach or suggest applying a test condition

10765361.4

Docket No. 002566-13000

Serial No. 09/287,296

Page 15

as claimed in Claim 12. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 12 is non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for this additional reason.

Claims 19, 20, and 30 depend from Claim 18 and are thus respectively submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the additional reasons given above for Claim 18.

Further regarding Claim 21, it further recites in step (iv) "... operations for testing the instruction using the extraction pattern and the contents of a buffer, wherein the buffer includes a portion of the web page output of the web site associated with the description of data of interest". Applicants respectfully submit that step (iv) is not addressed in the Examiner's rejection. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that step (iv) is not taught or suggested by Bowen, et al, and England, either singly or in any theoretical combination. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 21 is non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for these additional reasons.

Claim 31 depends from Claim 21 and is thus respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the additional reasons given above for Claim 21.

Claim 34 depends from Claim 32 and is thus respectfully submitted as being non-obvious based on Bowen, et al. in view of England for the additional reasons given above for Claim 32.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that all pending claims, Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-21, and 23-34, in the present application are allowable. Such allowance is respectfully solicited.


Docket No. 002566-13000

Serial No. 09/287,296

Page 16

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (415) 984-8200.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James W. Drapinski
Registration No. 46,242

October 25 2007
NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900
401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-2128
Telephone: (202) 585-8000

10765361.4